

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 7-12 and 26 are presently active; Claims 13-25 and 27 have been withdrawn from consideration, and Claims 1, 11, and 26 have been presently amended. Claims 5 and 6 were previously canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.¹

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakabe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,745,784) in view of Oh (U.S. Pat. No. 6,751,824). Claims 1 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakabe in view of Riedel (U.S. Pat. No. 6,817,369). Claims 2 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katakabe and Oh and further in view of Mandal (U.S. Pat. No. 6,770,424).

First of all, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Husband to speak with Applicant's representative on April 27, 2007 during which time the rejection of Katakabe and differentiations from Katakabe were discussed as substantially summarized below.

During the interview, Applicant's representative pointed out that Katakabe et al do not disclose that edge nozzle 26 extends from near center of the substrate toward a perimeter of the substrate. Rather, nozzle 26 in Katakabe et al is described as an "edge" nozzle. Even the movement of nozzle 26 in Katakabe et al (shown in Figure 2 by the displacement "L") is confined to the peripheral regions. Therefore, even Katakabe et al's teaching that any of the nozzles disclosed therein could be a plurality of nozzles does not disclose or suggest a nozzle array including a plurality of nozzles, with the nozzles arranged at fixed positions along a radial

¹ See Applicant's Figures 3 and 4 and numbered paragraph [0031] of the filed specification.

span extending from near center of the substrate toward a perimeter of the substrate and configured to dispense a rinse solution across the radial span, as defined in independent Claims 1, 11, and 26.

Agreement on this point seemed to be reached during the interview.

Lastly, during the interview, Examiner Husband brought to Applicant's representative's attention JP 11195635 (of record). However, element 7 in this reference is a "blow pipe" providing an inert gas to the surface of the wafer, evidently for drying purposes. Thus, this reference like Katakabe et al fails to disclose or suggest a nozzle array including a plurality of nozzles, with the nozzles arranged at fixed positions along a radial span extending from near center of the substrate toward a perimeter of the substrate and configured to dispense a rinse solution across the radial span.

Since M.P.E.P. § 2143 requires for a *prima facie* case of obviousness that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, independent Claims 1, 11, and 26 (and the claims dependent therefrom) are believed to patentably define over the art of record.

Application No. 10/673,254
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2007

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
GJM:RAR:clh

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouck
Registration No. 32,829
Attorney of Record
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\241051US\RESPONSE-TO-OA8142006.DOC